

## July 12 & 13, 2004 Advisory Committee Minutes

### Community Comments:

Kathleen Hansen complaint on blocked trail on school trust land (trust land or land) on Lion Mountain

**Present:** Sheila Bowen, Greg Gunderson, Gary Hall (noon – 2PM) , Jeff Gilman, Steve Lorch, Bick Smith, Diane Conradi, Sandy Gibson, Marty Zeller, Marshall Friedman, Lisa Horowitz, Richard Marriott (noon – 1, 5PM), Paul McKenzie, Donna Maddox (noon – 2 PM) Andy Feury (3 PM), Leesa Valentino (4 PM)

### Reviewed Principles or Criteria for Success

Richard brought up the issue of land use as development being part of the plan. Marty clarified that we would leave all items on the table at this point until we go through the full process. The group discussed the use of the word disposition: does it mean “sale” or does it mean any use of the land? The discussion centered on the different ways to develop.

Areas of concern:

**2.2.** Does this paragraph include traditional uses...logging, etc.? Add traditional. Add in perpetuity. Word it so it is managed for the beneficiaries. Discussed “full market value” versus “fair market value”...not a defined term but the term is in the statute.

**3.** Change real estate to land use changes and reword the part of “unmet needs”

**6.** Is having County included needed? Discussed County objectives. Remove the word County.

### Menu of Land Protection Techniques handout

Cash: Discussed if land is sold by auction by sealed bid or open auction. Public auction is what we will be using.

Land banking is under cash purchase.

Community Land Use...add limited density

### Review of Maps – planning issues related to possible land use of STL

Suggestion to add transfer fees to menu of options. For every transaction charge 1% in which ½% goes to the community to purchase other trust lands in the area of the plan and ½% goes to STL fund.

### Swift Creek

Original mapping:

Three phases Green areas on the map:

1. Community has 3 – 5 year to purchase with Conservation Preference.
2. Community options with Conservation Buyer with restriction of 1 – 3 homes.
  - Pay for one and conserve another piece.

- Pay two to three times the appraised price for one piece with some restrictions, and with mandatory protection of trails and access points identified through the plan
3. Sale of land to free market with restriction of 10 units maximum unless improvements take place with the road.

Identify trails: review of trail system that loops from Swift Creek south through the Beaver Lake complex to Spencer Mountain.

### **Spencer Lake**

Original mapping:

Put the land back into the hands of the community and have them determine how to put it into a conservation easement. Revenues produced by traditional uses, increased recreation permits, long term lease and determining value of 35 and 200 acres not actually part of Spencer, and planned development for the upper north east portion. (App. 60 homes?) This area would have a period of time, say a 10 year lease, to keep it in conservation with traditional/recreational uses, then the community would have this time to meet the financial requirements to keep it in traditional uses. Discussion on the pros and cons of clustering versus 20 acre home sites. Conclusion to take the southern area out of development potential, concentrate development in the three areas mentioned above and shown on the map.

### **Happy Valley**

Original mapping:

Very general... some development based on septic capability. Involve the community in developing the park.

### **KM**

Original mapping:

Develop west side with 10 – 12 units and east side is preserved, density transferred due to slopes and recreational uses.

### **Haskill**

Original mapping:

Private road access may be an issue for development. Watershed issue. Put in stream, trail corridor and forestry restrictions. Look for a conservation buyer for one or at the most two lots.

## **Tuesday, July 13, 2004**

**Present:** Sheila Bowen, Gary Hall (9 – 1PM), Jeff Gilman, Steve Lorch, Bick Smith, Diane Conradi, Sandy Gibson, Marty Zeller, Marshall Friedman, Lisa

Horowitz, Paul McKenzie, Andy Feury (9-noon), Leesa Valentino, Forrest Sanderson, Alan Elm, Greg Gunderson, Richard Marriott (noon)

Reviewed minutes from Monday, July 12, 2004. Corrections made.

## **Discussion**

Marshall started the discussion of his concerns of the current progress of the committee. Group discussion pursued regarding if we are creating a development plan. Marty expressed he does not want a development plan he is looking for a valuation plan for the trust lands. Called for a statement of confidence that Marty was the consultant of choice for this project. Group confirmed.

Andy ran through our beginning process that started with policies and procedures to help regulate the lands. We have gone to the next level and are now looking at each piece of land and finding permanent solutions so we don't have to keep reevaluating the lands. Andy stated that we should look at development as one of the tools and not dismiss it out of hand.

## **Community Comment:**

Dick Hefley came to ask for us to keep it natural with no development. He lives at the end of lake and spends his summers here. He suggests making it a natural monument to the people.

## **Spencer**

Make the community the developer ..a Spencer Mountain complex. Discussion on fundraising and how it would happen. One idea: appraise the entire property and then appraise as conservation land and the community pays the difference and the money goes to the community group to purchase some of the area for tradition uses. The group agreed that in this area we are looking for permanent protection. Discussed lease option for the area. Discussed community directed group. Above plan would be lease option....like a rent to own. " Transferring value" is the term used for the land transferred from state to the community.

Forrest Sanderson, County Planner, presented an alternate approach to the issue where a developer would be required to protect all of Spencer Mountain in exchange for development rights on certain portions determined through this planning process. Discussion ensued. A variety of tools may be used.

Discussion ensued in terms of what density would be appropriate for the entire complex. 66 units would equate to one home per 40 acres. The term density is used to equate to value. This density could be accomplished in the areas identified on Monday.

## **Next scheduled meeting with Marty**

Tuesday, August 31, noon – 6 PM and public meeting 7 – 9 PM

Wednesday, September 1st, 6 AM - Noon.

The committee will meet Thursday, July 15 at 7:00 AM for conference call at Alan's office. We will meet every Thursday going forward until the next meeting in August.

### **Beaver Lake/Skyles**

Original mapping:

Visual analysis will have to be done due to ability to see land from Whitefish. Save the heart of this area for the public. Any areas sold would have to have public rights. Preservation is the main goal. Land lease with renewal preference. Need to protect viewshed. Cluster concept in lower section of area below Beaver Lake. 140 units is base line for planning – based on current planning. Discussion about a proposal for is a commercial property by Murray Lake for back country lodge. This would be complementary with the network of trails planned for the area. We are protecting the viewshed for a large land owner in the area.

### **Stillwater**

Original mapping:

This ground is the transition for rural residential and city. Has a county road going through it. Long term management. Future uses will be determined by community need. Develop potential could be in area 35?? Units?? – area to the east side.

### **Discussed agenda for public meeting**

Guiding principles

Theme driving the approach...community preference

Looking at permanent protection

Describe trail system envisioned Concept of conservation preference

Tapping community and creativity to determine values

Highlight Spencer and Swift Creek

### **Handouts:**

Principles

Techniques

Maps

Pledge Forms